

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1 and 2 have not been amended or cancelled. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 2 remain pending.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,203,682 issued to Hodko. The Examiner asserts that the Hodko patent discloses an additive injection system used in *in-situ* soil remediation by electrokinetics for removing contaminants present in contaminated soil by applying electric power to an anode and a cathode to induce electroosmosis and electromigration in the soil wherein the anode and cathode are oppositely installed in the soil and the cathode is spaced apart from the anode at a thick distance. The Examiner also asserts that the Hodko patent discloses a cylindrical housing, an electrode selected from the anode and cathode and positioned in the cylindrical housing, a filter and a filler.

However, there is no disclosure in Hodko of the filter being adhered to the inner surface of the housing as set forth in Claim 1. Rather, Hodko discloses in Figure 1 that the filter (16) is outside of the housing (18) having holes extending through the walls. Furthermore, in Example 6 at column 12, line 60-62, Hodko discloses the anode wells being “wrapped with porous polyethylene filter to prevent the soils from entering the well.” This again indicates that the filter is on the outside of the housing that includes a plurality of slots and is not “adhered to the inner surface of the housing” as set forth in Claim 1.

Hodko also does not disclose the filler being “filled in the housing” as set forth in Claim 1. In Fig. 1 of the application, filler (5) is shown inside housing (2). Hodko, on the other hand, discloses in Fig. 1 the filler layer (14) outside the housing (18).

In addition, Hodko does not disclose the filler particles “surrounding” the electrode as set forth in Claims 1 and 2. As shown in Fig. 1 of the application, the electrode (4) is surrounded by filler (5).

Furthermore, the Examiner asserts that Hodko discloses that the filler particles have a permeability lower than the soil, citing Example 6. However, Example 6 of Hodko discloses the filler material as being a mixture of 20 wt% kaolinite and 80 wt% sand. There is no disclosure that this sandy filler material would have a permeability lower than the soil, as set forth in Claims 1 and 2. To the contrary, Hodko discloses that the disclosed device “is useful in sandy and/or loosely packed soil.” Col. 4, line 57.

In order to satisfy the requirements for anticipation, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be found in a single prior art reference. See MPEP §2131. Hodko does not satisfy this requirement.

Since Hodko does not disclose all of the elements claimed herein, Applicants respectfully submit that Hodko does not anticipate Claims 1 and 2. Accordingly, withdrawal of the anticipation rejection is respectfully submitted.

Applicants: Kim et al.
Application Serial No: 10/802,183
Filing Date: March 17, 2004
Docket: 673-19
Page 5 of 5

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of the pending claims is earnestly requested. If the examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this matter, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/james f. harrington/
James F. Harrington
Registration No. 44,741
Attorney for Applicants

HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP
6900 Jericho Turnpike
Syosset, New York 11791-4407
Tel. 516-822-3550
Fax. 516-822-3582
JFH:dlb:jp

288240